

Remarks

The Applicant has, for the sake of simplicity, cancelled all of the outstanding claims and submitted a new set of Claims 39 – 76. The Applicant respectfully submits that the newly submitted set of claims addresses the claim objections as applied to cancelled Claims 18 – 38, the §112 rejection of Claims 19 – 21 and the rejections of various ones of the claims over §§102 and 103.

In particular, the new set of claims is consistent with the use of methods, apparatus and distribution systems between independent and dependent claims as helpfully suggested by the Examiner with respect to cancelled Claims 18 – 38.

The newly submitted claims avoid the use of the “MPEG like” language recited with respect to cancelled Claims 19 – 21.

The newly submitted claims all contain language, either directly or indirectly, that recites that the video program(s) or the sequence(s) sent to the user are divided into two parts: the first part corresponding to the original video program in which some or all of the reference images are substituted and a second part corresponding to the original reference images and information allowing reconstruction of the original video program from the first part. This language is directly found in new independent Claim 39. Similarly, new independent Claim 59 recites that the storage or recording interface is adapted to store or record a first part of a video program corresponding to an original video program in which some or all of the I-frames are substituted and the apparatus is adapted to automatically connect to a multimedia server each time a user wants to watch a video program to obtain a second part of the video program corresponding to some or all of the original I-frames and to information allowing reconstruction of the original video program from the first part.

The Applicant notes that support for the above-recited language from Claims 39 and 59 may be found in original Claim 13 and at paragraphs [0111] – [0114] of the Applicant’s Specification.

The Applicant respectfully submits that all of the prior art applied against the original claims fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above-recited subject matter. This applies to Hendricks taken alone in the context of §102, Wunderlich in the context of §102, Hendricks in the context of §103, Hendricks in view of Ishibashi in the context of §103 and Hendricks in view of Donahue in the context of §103. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 39 – 76 are in condition for allowance.

Finally, the Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's helpful comments concerning the drawings. The Applicant therefore encloses replacement sheets Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 and respectfully requests that they be entered into the Official File.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for the Applicant

TDC:lh
(215) 656-3381

In the Drawings

Kindly replace Figs. 1 and 2 now of record with new Figs. 1 and 2 attached herewith.